

Reply to “Holographic principle in spacetimes with extra spatial dimensions” and “About quantum fluctuations and holographic principle in $(4 + n)$ -dimensional spacetime”

Fabio Scardigli^{a*} and Roberto Casadio^{b†}

^a*CENTRA, Departamento de Fisica, Instituto Superior Tecnico
Av. Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal*

^b*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bologna and I.N.F.N., Sezione di Bologna,
via Irnerio 46, 40126 Bologna, Italy*

Abstract

We reply to the comments by P. Midodashvili about our previous paper [1]. We argue that, contrary to the conclusions in Refs. [2, 3], the Generalized Uncertainty Principle proposed by Ng and van Dam in Ref. [4] is compatible with the Holographic Principle in spacetimes with extra dimensions only for a very special (and somehow unrealistic) choice of the relation between the size and mass of the clock.

PACS 04.60 - Quantum theory of gravitation.

P. Midodashvili in two recent papers [2, 3] studies Ng and Van Dam’s Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) [4] and concludes that it “complies with the holographic principle *also* in spacetimes *with* extra-dimensions”, in contrast with the result previously obtained in Ref. [1].

The arguments of Refs. [2, 3] appear to be based on the following two hypothesis:

1. besides the usual quantum mechanical and gravitational errors in distance measurements, the size a of the clock must be taken into account as an additional source of uncertainty in the total error;
2. the size of the clock can be written as

$$a = \alpha r_{S(4+n)} , \tag{1}$$

where α is a dimensionless coefficient and $r_{S(4+n)}$ the Schwarzschild radius of the clock in $4 + n$ dimensions. As the clock is not a black hole, one must assume $\alpha > 1$.

*Corresponding author address: Via Europa 20, 20097 S. Donato, Milano, Italy. E-mail: scardigli@fisica.ist.utl.pt

†E-mail: casadio@bo.infn.it

About the first hypothesis, we note that in Refs. [2, 3] no physical reason is given to clarify why the *whole* size a of the clock should *a priori* result in a distance error in the measurement process. In principle, the clock is a macroscopic object, with a very well defined geometric shape which is known before the measurement takes place. Of course, an uncertainty in the numerical value of a can be considered, but this obviously does not mean the whole size a gives an error in time measurements. Indeed, an argument in favour of such an assumption is the following: one should consider that there is an error δt in the registration time of the clock roughly given by the time a beam of light takes to travel the clock's size, that is $\delta t \sim a/c$. This may be considered as the typical accuracy of an “ideal” physical clock. In general, however, the actual sensor that captures the beam of light inside the clock will have a size b very likely much smaller than a and the error $\delta t \sim b/c \ll a/c$. Moreover, this estimate of δt only holds if the metric inside the clock is flat. If that is the case, one then does not see why it should be related to the gravitational radius of the *whole* clock $r_{S(4+n)}$, since there is no horizon at $r = r_{S(4+n)}$ inside the (flat) clock. It is clear that very detailed information about the clock inner structure is needed to estimate the error δt , for which it is therefore difficult to come to a general expression.

Bearing the above conclusion in mind, it is now easy to express the main objection to the second hypothesis of Refs. [2, 3]. In writing down Eq. (1), the Author assumes that α is a dimensionless number, larger than 1, but *independent* from the mass m of the clock. This is tantamount to the size of the clock going like $m^{1/(n+1)}$ for which the holographic scaling in $4 + n$ dimensions is then recovered. We however do not see any reason for using this particular scaling, which appears as a rather arbitrary claim. For example, a clock made of a constant density material would instead have $a \sim m^{1/(3+n)}$ (in $4 + n$ dimensions). To all practical purposes, the size a of a clock cannot be correlated with its mass m in any universal way and the hypothesis 2 therefore sounds too restrictive and, as such, misleading. Since in Ref. [1] we were looking for an “ideal” clock whose accuracy (including quantum and gravitational errors) is maximum, the expression of the error in distance measurements was minimized with respect to the mass of the clock. How each term in the expression of the error depends on the mass m is therefore crucial.

From the above observations several conclusions can now be drawn:

- a) an additional error b in distance measurements may be allowed, as indicated in Refs. [2, 3], of the order of the size a of the clock or, more likely, much smaller (*i.e.*, $b \ll a$);
- b) in any case, the error due to the size of the clock is essentially not correlated with the mass of the clock, and b must therefore be considered as a constant (with respect to m) in the global error on the measure of the length l (for the expressions of l_{QM} and l_C see Ref. [1]),

$$\delta l_{\text{tot}}(m) = \delta l_{QM}(m) + b + \delta l_C(m) ; \quad (2)$$

- c) by extremizing $\delta l_{\text{tot}}(m)$ with respect to m in 4 dimensions, one then gets

$$\frac{\partial l_{\text{tot}}(m)}{\partial m} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad m_{\text{min}} = c \left(\frac{\hbar l}{G_N^2} \right)^{1/3} , \quad (3)$$

where G_N is Newton's constant and

$$(\delta l_{\text{tot}})_{\text{min}} = 2 \left(\frac{\hbar G_N}{c^3} l \right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{\hbar G_N}{c^3} l \right)^{1/3} + b = 3 (\ell_p^2 l)^{1/3} + b , \quad (4)$$

which contains a term proportional to $l^{1/3}$ and ℓ_p is the Planck length. In $4 + n$ dimensions we shall have essentially the same result of Ref. [1],

$$(\delta l_{\text{tot}})_{\min} = N(n) \left(\frac{\ell_{(4+n)}^{n+2}}{a^n} l \right)^{1/3} + b, \quad (5)$$

with $N(n)$ a numerical coefficient and $\ell_{(4+n)}$ the fundamental gravitational length in $4 + n$ dimensions;

d) we can write the number of degrees of freedom in a volume of size l in 4 dimensions as

$$\mathcal{N}(V) = \left(\frac{l}{(\delta l_{\text{tot}})_{\min}} \right)^3 = \left(\frac{l}{3 (\ell_p^2 l)^{1/3} + b} \right)^3 \sim \left(\frac{l^2}{\ell_p^2} \right), \quad (6)$$

and holography is recovered for $l \gg b^3/\ell_p^2$ (ideally, one could take $b \sim \ell_p$ for the minimum size of the sensor). Instead, in $4 + n$ dimensions we have

$$\mathcal{N}(V) = \left(\frac{l}{(\delta l_{\text{tot}})_{\min}} \right)^{3+n} \sim \left(\frac{l}{\left(\ell_{(4+n)}^{n+2} l a^{-n} \right)^{1/3} + b} \right)^{3+n} \quad (7)$$

and the holographic counting is lost (since $n > 0$). Even for $l \gg a^n b^3/\ell_{(4+n)}^{n+2}$ one has

$$\mathcal{N}(V) \sim \left(\frac{l^2 a^n}{\ell_{(4+n)}^{2+n}} \right)^{1+\frac{n}{3}} \sim \left(\frac{l^2}{\ell_{(4+n)}^2} \right)^{1+\frac{n}{3}}, \quad (8)$$

in which we again considered the rather “ideal” case $a \sim \ell_{(4+n)}$.

Hence, the holographic counting is still lost in $4 + n$ dimensions, even if we remark here that the holographic bound is not violated, since $2(1 + n/3) < 2 + n$.

To conclude, we believe that the main result in Ref. [1], that holography does not appear compatible with the GUP of Ref. [4] in $4 + n$ dimensions, holds in general even if one properly includes in the computation an error due to the size of the clock. On the contrary, the result stated in Refs. [2, 3] requires a highly specific structure for the clock and the corresponding mass scaling (1), which is clearly not general. It would be interesting to experimentally test whether such a structure is indeed “unavoidable” in our real world or just an artifact to recover the holographic scaling.

References

- [1] F. Scardigli and R. Casadio, *Class.Quantum Grav.* **20**, 3915 (2003); *Braz. J. Phys.* **35** (2005) 470.
- [2] P. Midodashvili, “Holographic principle in spacetimes with extra spatial dimensions,” *hep-th/0602237*.

- [3] P. Midodashvili, “About quantum fluctuations and holographic principle in $(4+n)$ -dimensional spacetime”, Mod.Phys.Lett. A21 (2006) 1041-1048, hep-th/0602283.
- [4] Y.J. Ng and H. van Dam, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 9**, 335 (1994); Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 10**, 2801 (1995); Phys. Lett. **B 477**, 429 (2000); Y.J. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2946 (2001).